Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISS Washington, D.C. 20554

Minu

In the Matter of) STYLCE OF THE SECRETARY 1999
Implementation of the Subscriber Carrier)
Selection Changes Provision of the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996)
) CC Docket No. 94-129
Policies and Rules Concerning)
Unauthorized Changes of Consumers'	DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
Long Distance Carriers)

REPLY COMMENTS OF EXCEL TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Excel Telecommunications, Inc. ("Excel") respectfully submits these Reply Comments on the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the above-referenced proceeding pursuant to the Federal Communications Commission's ("Commission") Public Notice released March 25, 1999.

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Excel takes this opportunity to reply to comments filed addressing in particular one issue raised by the Commission in the *Further Rulemaking*. Excel respectfully urges the Commission to adopt rules which allow consumers to submit orders for telecommunications services and/or to

No. of Copies rec'd 0+3 List ABCDE

In the Matter of Implementation of the Subscriber Carrier Selection Changes Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Policies and Rules Concerning Unauthorized Changes of Consumers' Long Distance Carriers, Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CC Docket No. 94-129 (rel. Dec. 23, 1998) ("Report and Order" or "FNPRM").

implement or lift preferred carrier ("PC") freezes via the Internet without need for additional "off-line" verification.²

II. COMMENTS

Carrier Changes and PC Freezes Using the Internet

As Excel observed in its initial comments, use of the Internet for submission of carrier change orders and consumer requests to implement and/or lift PC freezes is the most important matter being considered by the Commission in this Further Rulemaking. Excel stresses the point it made in its initial comments, and those mirrored by other commenters: The Internet clearly holds the future of commerce. Crippling carriers' ability to obtain valid orders for telecommunications service via the Internet works only to the detriment of consumers and carriers, and stifles the continued growth of competition, without substantially bolstering protections against slamming.

Excel considers it quite telling that the majority of commenters, representing a wide variety of interests in the industry, urged the Commission to fashion rules which allow Internet-generated orders for telecommunication services and/or PC freezes to be verified without resorting to traditional off-line verification methods, such as an "inked" signature or third party verification.³ Excel notes that the concerns of the few commenters who asserted that Internet orders need be verified off-line can be addressed by carefully crafted rules. The Commission should work to foster this ever-growing communications medium to allow consumers and carriers to take advantage of the

Excel also urges the Commission to embrace and foster the proposals put forth by AT&T and MCI for the development of a neutral third party ("NTP") administrator for carrier change and freeze functions.

³ See, e.g., Comments of Tel-Save.Com, Inc., CoreComm, Ltd., Qwest, CompTel/ACTA, Cable & Wireless, the Florida Public Service Commission, Ameritech, RCN Telecom Services, and the Telecommunications Resellers Association.

extraordinary possibilities that the Internet offers, in terms of convenience, efficiency, and everexpanding availability, to mention but a few benefits.

Excel fully supports the vast majority of carriers that urge the Commission to permit the Internet to be used more extensively by the industry.⁴ As numerous commenters noted, the Internet continues to thrive due, in large part, to the fact that it has remained unregulated.⁵ The current uncertainty injected into the industry in light of the Commission's current policy is stifling the development of Internet-based marketing and ordering. Excel supports, and urges the Commission to adopt, the position that in implementing carrier changes and/or initiating or lifting PC freezes via the Internet, either a digital signature should suffice, or verification information should be collected, thus allowing for the order to be completed by the consumer entirely on-line, in a single transaction.

Certain commenters, however, urge the Commission to unnecessarily complicate and burden verification of consumers' carrier changes and PC freeze requests by means which would negate many of the advantages which the Internet provides. Excel respectfully submits that the concerns of those commenters opposing use of the Internet for submission of orders focus on the perceived difficulty in identifying the person requesting the change.⁶ Excel urges the Commission to reject these arguments because they can be addressed by means less drastic than disallowing consumers to submit valid orders via the Internet. As many parties demonstrated, carrier changes and PC freeze requests via the Internet are no less reliable, nor more subject to abuse, than those submitted by

See, e.g., Cable and Wireless Comments, at 2-5; CompTel/ACTA Comments, at 3-6, CoreComm Comments, at 2-3; TRA Comments, at 24.

See, e.g., Qwest Comments, at 16; MCI WorldCom Comments, at 23; Tel-Save Comments, at 7.

See, e.g., Bell Atlantic Comments, at 6.

telephone or written LOAs.⁷ Unfortunately, an unscrupulous carrier will find a way violate whatever rules are ultimately adopted, regarding written LOAs, telemarketing-generated orders <u>and</u> Internet orders; the answer for those carriers must be swift and severe enforcement actions. Requiring some form of off-line verification for Internet LOAs would defeat entirely the convenience of the Internet to consumers and carriers.

As discussed by many commenters, the concerns regarding the identity of the person submitting the order via the Internet could easily and adequately be addressed by requiring orders for service and/or PC freezes to include certain personal information, such as a social security number, birth date or a valid credit card account to ensure that only the subscriber may change his or her own carrier. As recommended by Excel and other commenters, the personal information provided by the consumer would be known only by the consumer. This is identical to the information that is gathered in third party verification for orders generated by telemarketing; there is no reason to differentiate between circumstances in which the information is submitted via the Internet rather than by telephone. 10

Ameritech Comments, at 16; Tel-Save Comments, at 13-16; CoreComm Comments, at 4.

Excel Comments, at 4; CoreComm Comments, at 4; TRA Comments, at 24-25.

See, e.g., Comments of the Florida Public Service Commission, the Missouri Public Service Commission, Excel, Ameritech, US WEST Communications, Inc., and RCN Telecom Services, Inc.

The Florida Public Service Commission ("PSC") proposes that carrier change information sent via the Internet be encrypted. Excel respectfully opposes adopting such a requirement based on the present status of encryption protocol – encryption is not standardized or generally utilized by many consumers. Any attempt at standardization by the Commission may be expensive and difficult to implement, and may not reflect the realities of the developing marketplace. Importantly, encryption is not necessary to protect the integrity of the personal information being transmitted: if the information is tampered with, it will not be accurate and no unauthorized change to a consumer's telephone service will occur. Excel reiterates its proposal that each carrier provide a description of the kind of security, if any, in use in accepting carrier change requests, so that subscribers may determine for themselves whether they want to send their

III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

Excel strongly supports the Commission's stated purpose in this proceeding to protect consumers and consumer choice. (*Report and Order*, ¶ 16). However, the Commission would do a disservice to consumers and carriers if it fashioned rules which crippled the ability of consumers to change carriers and/or implement or lift PC freezes via the Internet. In particular, consumers should be able to complete such transactions entirely on-line, assuming the adoption of simple protective mechanisms, such as those discussed in many parties' initial comments and these reply comments. Applying traditional verification methods, which disallow carrier selections and/or PC freezes being ordered in a single on-line transaction, will reduce the benefits offered by the Internet, and will result in fewer consumer choices being effectuated.

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Smith
Vice President, Law & Public Policy
Excel Telecommunications, Inc.
1133 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 750
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 331-4295

Dated: May 3, 1999

Dana Frix
Marcy Greene
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP
3000 K Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 424-7500

information via the Internet based on that disclosure.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Marcy A. Greene, hereby certify that on this 3rd day of May, 1999, a copy of the foregoing Reply Comments of Excel Telecommunications, Inc. was served on the parties on the attached list via first-class mail, postage pre-paid.

Marcy A. Greene

GARY PHILLIPS
AMERITECH
1401 H STREET, NW, SUITE 1020
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

JIM SPURLOCK
AT&T ROOM 520 SOUTH
1120 20TH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

LAWRENCE W. KATZ
BELL ATLANTIC
1320 NORTH COURT HOUSE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTO9N, VA 22201

RACHEL J. ROTHSTEIN
PAUL W. KENEFICK
JOHNATHAN SESSION
CABLE & WIRELESS USA, INC.
8219 LEESBURG PIKE
VIENNA, VA 22182

DANNY E. ADAMS, STEVEN A.
AUGUSTINO, PETER A. BATACAN
COUNSEL FOR COMPETITITVE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOC/ACTA
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
1200 19TH ST, NW, SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

JOSEPH R. GUERRA
RUDOLPH M. KAMMERER
SIDLEY & AUSTIN
COUNSEL FOR AT&T CORP.
1722 EYE STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

MARK C. ROSENBLUM
PETER H. JACOBY
AT&T CORP.
295 NORTH MAPLE AVENUE
BASKING RIDGE, NJ 07920

M. ROBERT SUTHERLAND
RICHARD M. SBARATTA
HELEN A SHOCKEY
BELLSOUTH CORPORATION
1155 PEACHTREE ST, NW, SUITE 1700
ATLANTA, GA 30306-3610
hillimmlillim

CHRISTOPHR J. WILSON
STAFF COUNSEL
CINCINNATI BELL TELEPHONE
COMPANY
201 EAST 4TH STREET, ROOM 102-620
CINCINNATI, OH 45201

CAROL ANN BISCHOFF
EX VP & GENERAL COUNSEL
COMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNCATIONS
ASSOCIATION/ACTA
1900 M STREET, NW, SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

MAGALIE ROMAN SALAS
OFFICE OF THE SECRTARY
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION
445 12TH STREET, SW, TWA-325
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

KIMBERLY PARKER
COMMON CARRIER BUREAU
FCC
445 12TH STREET, SW, ROOM 5C-827
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

MICHAEL J. SHORTLEY, III FRONTIER CORP. 180 SOUTH CLINTON AVENUE ROCHESTER, NY 14646 BARRY PINELES
REGULATORY COUNSEL
GST TELECOM INC.
4001 MAIN STREET
VANCOUVER, WA 98663

JOHN F. RAPOSA
GTE SERVICE CORPORATION
600 HIDDEN RIDGE, HQE03J27
POB 152092
IRVING, TX 75015-2092

ANDRE J. LACHANCE GTE SERVICE CORPORATION 1850 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20036

KENNETH T. BURCHETT VICE PRESIDENT GVNW INC./MANAGEMENT 8050 S.W. WARM SPRINGS TUALATIN, OR 97062 INTERNATIONAL TRANSCIPTION SERVICE 1231 20TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20036

LARRY D. BARNES
DIRECTOR - REGULATORY AFFAIRS
IXC COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INC.
1122 CAPITAL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY S.
AUSTIN, TX 78746-6426

MARY L. BROWN
MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORP.
1801 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

SUSAN M. EID, VP, FEDERAL RELATIONS TINA S. PYLE, EXEC DIR FOR PUBLIC POLICY RICHAD A. KARRE, SENIOR ATTORNEY 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, NW, SUIT 610 WASHINGTON, DC 20006

LERA L. SHEMWELL
ATTORNEYS FOR THE STAFF OF THE
MISSOURI PSC
POB 360
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102

ROBIN McHUGH, ATTORNEY MONTANA PSC POB 202601 HELENA, MT 59620-2601 SARAH REZNEK
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL
750 FIRST STREET, NE, SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20002

MICHAEL J. TRAVIESO
COUNSEL FOR NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF UTILITY CONSUMER ADVOCATES
6 ST. PAUL STREET, SUITE 2102
BALTIMORE, MD 21202

LINDA F. GOLODNER
SUSAN GRANT
VICE PRESIDENT PUBLIC POLICY
NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE
1701 K STREET, NW, SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

TIMOTHY FAIN
OMB DESK OFFICER
10236 NEOB
725 17TH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20503

NEIL S. ENDE
STEVEN D. HITCHCOCK
TECHNOLOGY LAW GROUP, LLC
COUNSEL FOR PRICEINTERACTIVE, INC.
5335 WISCONSIN AVE, NW, SUITE 440
WASHINGTON, DC 20015

CYNTHIA B. MILLER
SENIOR ATTORNEY
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2540 SHUMARD OAK BLVD
TALLAHASSEE, FL 32399-0850

LAWRENCE G. MALONE
GENERAL COUNSEL
PSC OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THREE EMPIRE STATE PLAZA
ALBANY, NY 12223-1350

GENEVIEVE MORELLI
JANE KUNKA
QWEST COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
4250 NORTH FAIRFAX DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

LEON M. KESTENBAUM MICHAEL B. FINGERHUT NORINA T. MOY SPRINT CORPORATION 1850 M ST, NW, SUITE 1110 WASHINGTON, DC 20036

RICHARD FIRESTONE, PAUL S. FEIRA NICHOLAS I. PORRITT ARNOLD & PORTER COUNSEL FOR TEL-SAVE INC. 6805 ROUTE 202 NEW HOPE, PA 18938

KATHRYN MARIE KRAUSE COUNSEL FOR US WEST COMM, INC. 1020 19TH ST, NW, SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036 ROBERT M. LYNCH
ROGER K. TOPPINS
BARBARA R. HUNT
SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.
ONE BELL PLAZA, ROOM 3026
DALLAS, TX 75202

CHARLES C. HUNTER
CATHERINE M. HANNAN
HUNTER COMMUNICATIONS GROUP
COUNSEL FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS
RESELLERS ASSOCIATION
1620 I ST, NW, SUITE 701
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

LEONARD J. KENNEDY
LORETTA J. GARCIA
DOW LOHNES & ALBERTSON, PLLC
COUNSEL FOR TELTRUST
1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

JAMES VEILLEUX
PRESIDENT
VOICELOG LLC
9509 HANOVER SOUTH TRAIL
CHARLOTTE, NC 28210